

inhabited by this species are not uniform; several habitat types are distinguishable. The species inhabits primary dunes, interdune areas, secondary dunes, and scrub dunes. The depth and area of these habitats from the beach inland varies. Population surveys indicate that this subspecies is usually more abundant in primary dunes than in secondary dunes, and usually more abundant in secondary dunes than in scrub dunes. Optimal habitat consists of dune systems with all dune types. Though fewer ABM inhabit scrub dunes, these high dunes can serve as refugia during devastating hurricanes that overwash, flood, and destroy or alter secondary and frontal dunes. ABM surveys on the Applicant's property reveal habitat occupied by ABM. The Applicant's property contains designated critical habitat for the ABM. Construction of the project may result in the death of, or injury to, ABM. Habitat alterations due to house placement and its subsequent use may reduce available habitat for food, shelter, and reproduction. Further, the Applicant's property borders the BSNWR, and is considered Priority I lands for inclusion into the Perdue Unit (of BSNWR).

The Environmental Assessment considers the environmental consequences of several alternatives. One action proposed is the issuance of the incidental take permit. This alternative provides for restrictions that include placing landward of the designated ABM critical habitat, establishment of a walkover structure across that scrub dune, a prohibition against housing or keeping pet cats, ABM competitor control and monitoring measures, scavenger-proof garbage containers, restoration of dune systems impacted by the construction, creation of a mitigation endowment for offsite acquisition of suitable ABM habitat, and the minimization and control of outdoor lighting. The Habitat Conservation Plan provides a funding source for these mitigation measures. Another alternative is Service acquisition of the property for inclusion into the BSNWR. A third alternative is no-action, or deny the request for authorization to incidentally take the ABM.

Dated: June 13, 1995.

Jerome M. Butler,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 95-15012 Filed 6-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before June 10, 1995. Pursuant to § 60.13 of 36 CFR Part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the National Register, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127. Written comments should be submitted by July 5, 1995.

Carol D. Shull,

Keeper of the National Register.

Alabama

Morgan County

New Decatur—Albany Historic District, Roughly, 2d Ave. (100 block NE., 100 block SE. E side, 300 block SE. W side) and parts of Johnson and Moulton Sts., Decatur, 95000810

Florida

Dade County

Barracks and Mess Building—U.S. Coast Guard Air Station at Dinner Key, 2610 Tigertail Ave., Miami, 95000816

Georgia

Bulloch County

Donehoo—Brannen House, 332 Savannah Ave., Statesboro, 95000826

Dodge County

Eastman, William Pitt, House, 407 Eastman Way, Eastman, 95000824

Jackson County

Williamson—Maley—Turner Farm, GA 15 NE of Jefferson, Jefferson vicinity, 95000823

Stephens County

Martin Historic District, Along both sides of GA 17 and the Norfolk Southern RR tracks, Martin, 95000825

Iowa

Johnson County

St. Mary's Rectory, 610 E. Jefferson St., Iowa City, 95000811

Louisiana

Acadia Parish

Lewis & Taylor Lumberyard Office, 403 E. Louisiana Ave., Rayne, 95000812

De Soto Parish

Grand Cane Historic District, U.S. 171, roughly between Burrow and Graham Sts., Grand Cane, 95000815

Ouachita Parish

Filhiol, Roland M., House, 111 Stone Ave., Monroe, 95000813

Minnesota

Dakota County

First Presbyterian Church, 602 Vermillion St., Hastings, 95000822

Hennepin County

Chamber of Commerce, 400-412 S. 4th St., 301 4th Ave. S., Minneapolis, 95000821

Second Church of Christ, Scientist, Administration Building, 1115 Second Ave. S., Minneapolis, 95000820

New York

Warren County

Land Tortoise (radeau) Shipwreck Site, Address Restricted, Lake George vicinity, 95000819

South Dakota

Corson County

Holy Spirit Chapel, SE of SD 65 crossing of Grand R., N of Firesteel, Firesteel vicinity, 95000817

Vermont

Windsor County

Progressive Market, 63 S. Main St., Hartford, 95000814

Virginia

Brunswick County

Rocky Run Methodist Church, VA 616, 1.8 mi. E of jct. with VA 46, Alberta vicinity, 95000828

Hanover County

Laurel Meadow, VA 643 E side, 0.2 mi. S of jct. with VA 627, Mechanicsville vicinity, 95000827

Tazewell County

Old Kentucky Turnpike Historic District, Along Indian Creek Rd., Old Kentucky Tnpk., College Hill Rd. and Cedar Valley Dr., Cedar Bluff, 95000829

Richmond Independent City

Shockoe Hill Cemetery, Jct. of Hospital and 2nd Sts., Richmond (Independent City), 95000818.

In order to assist in the preservation of the following property, the commenting period has been shortened to 5 days:

Arkansas

Pulaski County

Beal—Burrow Dry Goods Building, (Thompson, Charles L., Design

Collection TR), 107 E. Markham,
Little Rock, 87001546.

[FR Doc. 95-15022 Filed 6-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

**Draft Recommendations Regarding the
Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable
Human Remains and Associated
Funerary Objects**

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice and request for
comments.

SUMMARY:

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3007(c)(5).) requires the Review Committee to recommend specific actions for developing a process for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable Native American human remains. The seven individuals on the committee have given this matter great thought and have developed the enclosed draft outlining their position and several options. The enclosed draft is intended for wide circulation to elicit comments from Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, museum, Federal agencies, and national scientific and museum organizations. We are publishing this draft in the *Federal Register* for broad public comment.

EFFECTIVE DATES:

Comments should be received by September 30, 1995 in order for them to receive the committee's full consideration at their next scheduled meeting. For additional information, please contact Dr. C. Timothy McKeown at (202) 343-4101.

Please note that we will not accept any comments in electronic form.

ADDRESS FOR COMMENT:

Anyone interested in commenting on the committee's draft recommendations should send written comments to:

The NAGPRA Review Committee
c/o Archeological Assistance Division
National Park Service
Box 37127, Suite 210
Washington DC, 20013-7127

Dated: June 14, 1995

Veletta Canouts,

Acting, Departmental Consulting
Archeologist

Acting Chief, Archeological Assistance
Division

Call For Comments

Draft Recommendations By The

N.A.G.P.R.A. Review Committee

On The Disposition Of

Culturally Unidentifiable

Native American Remains

Under NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3007(c)(5)) the Review Committee is specifically charged with "compiling an inventory of culturally unidentifiable human remains that are in the possession or control of each Federal agency and museum and recommending specific actions for developing a process for disposition of such remains." What follows below is a draft of recommendations from the Review Committee to the Secretary in compliance with the mandate in NAGPRA. This draft is intended for wide circulation to elicit the comments, suggestions and opinions of members of Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, scientific organizations, and museums as described under 25 U.S.C. 3007 (e). We wish to emphasize that these recommendations are preliminary and every element is open to change depending on the comments of the public.

In fulfilling their responsibility, the Review Committee makes the following observations and recommendations:

1. Although the disposition of culturally "unidentifiable human remains" is left open in NAGPRA, there is a firmly established principle in the act that assigns responsibility for what happens to human remains and associated funerary objects to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated tribes. This general principle should be followed in determining the disposition of culturally "unidentifiable human remains" that are known to be ancestral Native Americans. It is true that there are remains and associated funerary objects in museums and Federal agencies for which it is not possible to identify specific cultural connections to any particular tribe today. However, such remains and objects, no matter how ancient, are nevertheless Native American, and they should be treated according to the wishes of the Native American community. *Ultimately, decisions about what happens to the remains of Native American individuals from anywhere in the United States and associated funerary objects should rest in the hands of Native Americans.* These decisions can and should be informed by anthropological, archaeological, historical, folkloric, biological, linguistic and spiritual evidence, and nonNative Americans can

and should be consulted when appropriate in the decision making process. However, the final decision should be made entirely by Native American people.

2. Although the Act specifically mentions only "unidentifiable human remains", it is consistent with other aspects of the Act to include in this discussion "associated funerary objects" as well. Therefore all recommendations on the disposition of unidentifiable human remains also apply to any funerary objects that are associated with those remains as those terms are defined in the Act. It may be that additional legislation will be required to insure that Native American groups are provided with the opportunity to repatriate associated funerary objects accompanying unidentified remains.

3. The Committee has heard extensive testimony from physical anthropologists and archaeologists as to the broader scientific, medical, and humanistic values that may be gained from analysis of Native American skeletal remains from both the recent and distant past. While the Committee recognizes there may be potential value in such analyses, such values do not provide or confer a right of control over Native American human remains that supersedes the spiritual and cultural concerns of Native American people who clearly have the closest general affiliation to these remains. The issue is not whether there is positive benefit to be gained from analysis of remains, but who has the right and responsibility to make decisions about whether such analysis should take place.

It is the responsibility of archaeologists and physical anthropologists to communicate with Native American tribes and groups to inform them of the potential values of analysis of human remains and associated funerary objects and allow the tribes and groups to use this information as they choose in making their decisions about the treatment and disposition of those remains and objects.

4. The term "unidentifiable human remains" can be applied to three different groups of remains and these should be considered separately. The three categories include: 1. remains for which there is cultural affiliation with Native American groups who are not formally recognized by the BIA; 2. ancient remains for which there is specific information about the original location and circumstances of the burial; and 3. remains which may be Native American but which lack information about their original burial location.